

10/30/69

Dear Cyril,

In various ways, as time and circumstances permit, I am preparing to get what we didn't get in the proceeding in Judge Halleck's court. Much of this is unknown to you because you were never able to come here and see what I have accumulated. However, soon I hope to resume writing POST MORTEM II, where I will include it, and then you will see.

Of the perjury I charge in PM III I now have even more overwhelming proof. I have new, specific and documentary proof of Finck, in two jurisdictions, Louisiana and DC.

I have begun to study his N.O. testimony, having read it hastily. I find interesting things in it. As with the Washington WC testimony, I have difficulty believing the evidence on and testimony about the head wound can in any way be attributed to the behavior of a full-jacketed, military bullet; from what I have been able to learn, it just is not reasonable to believe that such a bullet could have wound up in so many minute fragments.

Enclosed are pages 33-9 of Finck's N.O. testimony (direct). He goes into this here. I ask that you tell me what you can on this (and any other comment you would care to offer on other aspects) and, if you have it available, xerox copies of what the standard sources say of this so that I may, if it seems desirable, include them in photocopy in the book.

I just cannot imagine a man pretending forensic-medical competence and sufficiently informed to be chief of the Army's wound-ballistics branch, saying what happened in the head could have been from a military bullet.

Finck is quite a character, a real authoritarian, European type, unless I misread his character while reading his testimony. He is so contemptuous of the mere mortals with whom he is so unpleasantly forced to associate that he feels compelled to tolerate their ignorance and spell out for them such simple words as "out". However, I have come to respect him as a real snake. He is a man of incredible evasiveness, which flags my interest and excites my curiosity. To avoid he talks of other things, which please me, for they are things about which I welcome his words. In the course of examining what he volunteered and where he suddenly pretended not to understand the question, I have a case where he pretty clearly says what was unknown, that to his knowledge the staff of the Commission did examine the pictures or X-rays. He unbagged other cats, never realizing what he was doing.

I think Bud has come around to my belief, that we use as some of our witnesses when we get into court on the suit he is filing for me (not duplicating John Nichols') the unfriendlies. I would dearly love, myself, to be able to examine the trio of doctors. And others. It is tedious to build a record, but we now have enough to out them in jail, which I regard as an impossible but desirable thing.

Thanks and best regards,

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg